13th August 1954]

SRI S. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—" May I know whether these Harijan ryots waited in deputation on the Hon. Chief Minister and the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue? I do not know what has become of the petition that was submitted to the Hon. Minister for Land Revenue. I would like to know what action has been taken on the petition of these Harijan ryots."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" The petition was thoroughly examined. It was found baseless. I also thought at first that there would be some truth. But on examination, I found that there was no foundation for the complaint referred to in the petition."

Construction of West Coast road.

* 1415 *Q.*—SRI T. ANANTA PAI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have received any communication from the Central Government regarding the construction of a West Coast Road ; and

(*b*) if so, when the Government will start this work?

THE HON. RAJA SRI SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI :—" (*a*) Yes, Sir.

" (*b*) Some of the works on the road are under execution and the remaining works will be taken up shortly in batches."

Starting of a bus route from Ponnani to Chalissery via *Changaramkulam.*

* 1416 *Q.*—SRI E. T. KUNHAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state whether the Government have any proposal to start a bus route from Ponnani to Chalissery *via* Changaramkulam?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN :—" (*a*) The answer is in the negative."

Special rules for the Madras State Higher Judicial Service.

* 1417 *Q.*—SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether in 1951, the Government issued orders constituting the Madras State Higher Judicial Service and integrating the posts of District Munsifs, Subdivisional Magistrates, Presidency Magistrates and Sub-Judges;

(*b*) how many persons in the Madras Subordinate Judicial Service lost their seniority or were affected otherwise, as a consequence of the abovesaid order;

[13th August 1954

(c) the services of how many persons in the post of Presidency Magistrates appointed temporarily under emergency provisions from the cadre of Deputy Collectors and Madras Civil Service (Executive Branch) were regularized as members of the Madras State Judicial Service;

(d) whether the Madras Public Service Commission were consulted in the matter;

(e) if not, whether the Commission pointed out that the decision of the Government was *ultra vires* in so far it related to the Madras State Judicial Service; and

(f) whether the Government subsequently made consultation with the Public Service Commission and made any revision of the orders; and, if not, why not?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" (a) Separate rules called the special rules for the Madras State Higher Judicial Service were issued in 1951 in respect of posts of District Judges and certain isolated posts.

Other posts in the subordinate judiciary, namely, Sub-Judges, District Munsifs, Judicial Subdivisional Magistrates and Presidency Magistrates were constituted into one cadre consequent on the implementation of the Scheme of Separation of the Judiciary. In regard to these posts certain tentative decisions were taken in 1951 which were embodied in the special rules for the State Judicial Service in October 1953 after consulting the Services Commission and the High Court.

" (b) & (c) Presumably the hon. Member is referring to the decision taken tentatively in 1951 in regard to six persons who had been appointed as Presidency Magistrates temporarily. These persons were previously members of the Bar with experience on the criminal side. The question of absorbing them regularly is still under consideration of the Government and no final decision has been taken. No question of loss of seniority of other officers has yet arisen.

" (d) to (f) The tentative decisions were reached without consulting the Commission. The Commission raised an objection on the assumption that the decisions were final but the position was explained to the Commission subsequently. The Government have now accepted a course suggested by the Commission on the question of regularizing the services of the six persons who were appointed temporarily and the matter is pending with the Commission."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—" May I know whether any complaint was received by Government from members of the Judicial Service affected by seniority, regarding these rules? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Yes, Sir. I remember certain complaints were received."

13th August 1954]

Dispute between the workers and the management of the Deccan Sugar and Abkari Company, Limited, Pugalur, Tiruchirappalli district.

* 1418 *Q.*—SRI M. KALYANASUNDRAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) Whether the Government have received any representations from the Sugar Factory Mill Workers' Union of the Pugalur Sugar Factory, Tiruchirappalli district, alleging large-scale retrenchment of workers and conversion of a large number of workers as casual labourers; and

(*b*) what steps the Government have taken to settle the dispute between the workers and management in this regard?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" (*a*) The Government have received a representation from the Deccan Sugar and Abkhari Company, Limited, Workers' Union, Pugalur, alleging cut in wages and non-employment of about fifty workers on the re-opening of the factory on 1st March 1954.

" (*b*) The Government, after considering the conciliation report of the Labour Officer, have decided that there is no case for intervention on any of the disputes raised by the union. The union has been informed accordingly."

SRI M. KALYANASUNDRAM :—" கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த கம்பெனியின் மானேஜ்மென்டை பாரி கம்பெனியே பார்ப்பதாக கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொன்ன பதிலில் இருந்து தெரியவருகிறது. பாரி கம்பெனியும் பிரிட்டிஷ் கம்பெனியாக இருப்பதனால் இந்த மாதிரி அடஜூடிகேஷன் விஷயத்தில் என்ன கொள்கை கையாளப்படுகிறது ?"

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" I need not seriously refute the insinuation made by the hon. Member. Each case is examined on its merits. Only after close examination of all aspects, we decided not to refer this matter for adjudication. I shall give the reasons :

(1) *Re-employment of fifty permanent workers.*—It has been reported that the management and the union have come to an understanding as a result of the intervention of the growers of Pugalur. No action is therefore considered necessary regarding their re-employment.

(2) The workers were discharged at the time of the closure of the concern and they would have no further claim on the company. They were recruited afresh purely on a temporary basis when the factory was opened for a short duration at the request of the cane growers on new terms of contract. The terms about an all inclusive wage were clearly indicated in the notice put up by the management and the workers accepted to work under the new conditions. The workers could therefore have no grievance that they were not paid wages at the old rates.

It was on these considerations that Government could not refer this matter to adjudication."